

March 3, 1975

LB 81 until tomorrow, Senator?

SENATOR SIMPSON: That would be fine.

PRESIDENT: Is there any objection? The consent is granted by the House. Mr. Clerk, please read on Final Reading LB 62.

CLERK: LB 62. Final Reading.

(Recorder turned off)

CLERK: LB 260 to Select File for specific amendment, to strike the enacting clause. Signed Senator Chambers.

PRESIDENT: The motion is to move 260, constitutional amendment, refer it to Select Committee for specific amendment. Do you wish to be heard, Senator Chambers?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members, I will briefly explain why. This is a bill which would allow a governmental subdivision to go into debt for the purpose of taking property, clearing it once it is considered blighted and allowing redevelopment. When Senator Cavanaugh introduced the bill, he was under the impression that it was restricted to commercial redevelopment and he was thinking of the downtown area of Omaha. I told him that if I could be sure that was what the bill was for, I would not have opposition but to guarantee that that was its purpose I considered the possibility of inserting the word commercial in two places by the way of amendment but because the constitution shouldn't be unduly restrictive and cluttered, I didn't offer the amendment. In the meantime, I have talked to the Mayor of Omaha and his concern, primarily, is not commercial property but taking of residential areas by this method and I told Senator Cavanaugh in the beginning I was opposed to the bill being used for that purpose. He said he did not understand that to be its purpose but now that it is brought to his attention, I am moving that this bill be returned to Select File to strike the enacting clause because I don't think a provision like this should be put into the constitution to allow the taking of residential property. It is a thinly disguised method of urban renewal which can be utilized without a vote or even knowledge of the people, in some cases.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd oppose the motion and I would offer some correction to some of Senator Chamber's observations. I did not state to this body or have I ever stated that the LB 260 would be restricted to commercial redevelopment, only. I indicated to this body that it was my feeling that it was an appropriate vehicle for commercial redevelopment and would probably be a less desirable vehicle in my mind for residential redevelopment. The question, of course, is, LB 260 is a tax utilization method for redevelopment and it necessarily would have to be drafted in broad language and so the language of 260 would permit residential redevelopment, although I do not, personally, believe that that is a proper vehicle for that purpose. Now what LB 260 would do is allow the property taxes to be applied for the acquisition and preparation of certain blighted properties in blighted